UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/965,772 | 09/27/2001 | Tomio Amano | JP9-2000-0267US1 (590.083 | 3441 |

35195 7590 07/17/2008
FERENCE & ASSOCIATES LLC
409 BROAD STREET
PITTSBURGH, PA 15143

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| DESAI, RACHNA SINGH | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2176 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 07/17/2008 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 09/965,772 | AMANO, TOMIO | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Rachna S. Desai | 2176 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 May 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-11 and 20-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 4-11, and 20-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to: Amendments and Remarks filed on 05/05/08.

2. Claims 1-2, 4-11, and 20-24 are pending. Claims 12-19 are withdrawn. Claim 24 is a new claim.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 6-11, and 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantrowitz et al., US 6,618,697 B1, 09/09/03 (filed 05/14/99) in view of DeMont, US 5,920,878, 07/06/99.

**Regarding claim 1,** Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the preamble, ***an error correction support method for application data***. See columns 1-2.

Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the limitation, ***providing error correction support for application data. . .that is to be exchanged between computing devices***. See columns 1-2. *Examiner note: word processing documents and OCR documents can be exchanged between computing devices.*

Kantrowitz teaches preventing errors and incorrect character conversions that occur while inputting text in a word processing program used to write words and sentences by replacing the words using correction code which meets the portion of the limitation, ***prevent errors or incorrect character conversions that occur frequently during the re-input of text . . . used to write data or sentences.*** See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz teaches rewriting information in the word processing application such that the errors and incorrect conversions are corrected using certain rules which meets the portion of the limitation, ***add rewritten information to a predetermined portion of said application data. . .in order that the number of said errors and incorrect character conversions occurring during re-input of text is reduced.***. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz does not explicitly teach defining a tag set to prevent errors or that the application data is written in a markup description language. DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language which meets the limitation, ***application data written in a markup description.*** See column 2, lines 58-67.

DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitation, ***defining a tag set to prevent errors; using the tag set to add rewritten information***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 2,** Kantrowitz teaches preventing errors for characters having the same shape, a space, or a similar character. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz. Kantrowitz does not expressly state defining a tag set to prevent these errors. DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the

portion of the limitation, ***defining a tag set***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 4,** Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the preamble, ***an error correction support method for application data***. See columns 1-2.

Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the limitation, ***providing error correction support for application data. . .that is to be exchanged between computing devices***. See columns 1-2. *Examiner note: word processing documents and OCR documents can be exchanged between computing devices.*

Kantrowitz teaches selecting an entire document for error correction support which meets the limitation, ***selecting a text portion that needs error correction***

***support***. See columns 1-2. Kantrowitz teaches preventing errors and incorrect character conversions that occur while inputting text in a word processing program used to write words and sentences by replacing the words using correction code which meets the portion of the limitation, ***said error correction related to errors comprising errors or incorrect character conversions that occur frequently during the re-input of text . . . used to write data or sentences.*** See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz teaches rewriting information in the word processing application such that the errors and incorrect conversions are corrected using certain rules which meets the portion of the limitation, ***in order that the number of said errors or incorrect character conversions is ultimately reduced.***. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz does not explicitly teach writing correction code based on a predetermined algorithm or that the application data is written in a markup description language. DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language which meets the limitation, ***application data written in a markup description*** and ***enclosing text portion using predetermined tags.*** See column 2, lines 58-67. DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitation,

***writing correction code based on a predetermined algorithm***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 5,** Kantrowitz teaches rewriting information in the word processing application such that the errors and incorrect conversions that occur among characters that are similar, inserted spaces, etc are corrected using certain rules. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-67, and columns 9-10. Kantrowitz does not explicitly teach ***writing correcting code for a character string that represents an attribute value or name using a predetermined attribute for the description of an error code.*** DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language. See column 2, lines 58-67. DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitations, ***writing said attribute types to said***

***application data using a predetermined attribute for the description of an error code***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 23,** Kantrowitz does not teach removing correction code and tags and returning application data written in a markup language to its original form. However, DeMont teaches encoding a document with a plurality of tags from a markup language document where the document appears in its original form. See columns 4-5.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 6,** Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the preamble, ***an error correction support method for application data***. See columns 1-2.

Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the limitation, ***providing error correction support for application data. . .that is to be exchanged between computing devices***. See columns 1-2. *Examiner note: word processing documents and OCR documents can be exchanged between computing devices.*

Kantrowitz teaches selecting an entire document for error correction support which meets the limitation, ***selecting character strings that require error correction support***. See columns 1-2. Kantrowitz teaches preventing errors and incorrect character conversions that occur while inputting text in a word processing program used to write words and sentences by replacing the words using correction code. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz teaches rewriting information in the word processing application such that the errors and incorrect conversions are corrected using certain rules which meets the portion of the limitation, ***in order that the number of selected character string errors is ultimately reduced.***. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz does not explicitly teach generating correction code based on a predetermined algorithm or that the application data is written in a markup description language. DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language which meets the limitation, ***application data written in a markup.*** See column 2, lines 58-67. DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitations, ***writing said error correction codes as nodes for said application data written in descriptive markup language and generating for said selected character strings, error correction codes that are based on a predetermined algorithm***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 7,** Kantrowitz does not teach the error correction codes are generated for character strings and added after predetermined elements of application

data have been written; however, DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitations, ***generating error correction codes for all multiple character strings that are selected and added after predetermined elements of said application data have been written***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 8,** Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the preamble, ***an error correction support method for application data***. See columns 1-2.

Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program

which meets the limitation, ***providing error correction support for application data. . .that is to be exchanged between computing devices***. See columns 1-2. *Examiner note: word processing documents and OCR documents can be exchanged between computing devices.*

Kantrowitz teaches selecting an entire document for error correction support. See columns 1-2. Kantrowitz teaches preventing errors and incorrect character conversions that occur while inputting text in a word processing program used to write words and sentences by replacing the words using correction code. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10. Kantrowitz teaches rewriting information in the word processing application such that the errors and incorrect conversions that occur among characters that are similar, inserted spaces, etc are corrected using certain rules which meets the portion of the limitation, ***sorting, into predetermined attribute types, words in said application data that may constitute barriers in a context process***. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-67, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz does not explicitly teach ***writing attribute types using a predetermined tag set*** or ***the application data is written in a markup language.*** DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language which meets the limitation, ***application data written in a markup.*** See column 2, lines 58-67. DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can

be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitations, ***writing said attribute types to said application data using a predetermined tag set***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 9,** Kantrowitz eaches that one of the words that may constitute barriers in the context process may be a parts of speech which meets the limitation, ***said words are sorted into said predetermined attribute types and that may constitute barriers in said context process is at least one of a set comprising proper nouns, alphabetic abbreviations, tag names, keywords that appear as element values, attribute names, keywords that appear as attribute values.*** **See page 2, lines 34-67.**

**Regarding claim 10,** Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting

recognition program which meets the preamble, ***an system for generating application data***. See columns 1-2.

Kantrowitz teaches a method for correcting errors that occur in a word processing program, OCR program, or automatic handwriting recognition program which meets the limitation, ***provides error correction support for application data. . .that is to be exchanged between computing devices***. See columns 1-2. *Examiner note: word processing documents and OCR documents can be exchanged between computing devices.*

Kantrowitz teaches selecting an entire document for error correction support. See columns 1-2. Kantrowitz teaches preventing errors and incorrect character conversions that occur while inputting text in a word processing program used to write words and sentences by replacing the words using correction code which meets the portion of the limitation, ***information used for replacing a predetermined portion of said application data.*** See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10. Kantrowitz teaches rewriting information in the word processing application such that the errors and incorrect conversions are corrected using certain rules which meets the limitation, ***an outputter which outputs said application data with correction information***. See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz does not explicitly teach ***a markup addition profile wherein information used to replace the portion of application data is replaced with tags*** or ***a markup addition module for adding to said application data said tags.*** DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language. See

column 2, lines 58-67. DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitations, ***replacing a predetermined portion of said application data with tags and/or information for calculating error detection/correction code for said predetermined portion*** and ***adding to said application data, to generate application data using correction information, said tags and/or said error detection/correction code***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**Regarding claim 11,** Kantrowitz does not teach a markup addition profile for inserting error correction code into said application data; however, DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a

Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitations, ***markup addition profile includes information used to insert said error detection/correction code into said application data***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

**With respect to claims 20-22**, claims 20-22 are substantially similar to claim 1 and therefore are rejected under the same rationale used in claim 1 above.

5. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kantrowitz et al., US 6,618,697 B1, 09/09/03 (filed 05/14/99) in view of DeMont, US 5,920,878, 07/06/99, as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Kopec et al., US 5,883,986, 03/16/99.

**Regarding claim 24,** Kantrowitz teaches preventing errors and incorrect character conversions that occur while inputting text in a word processing program used to write words and sentences by replacing the words using correction code which meets the portion of the limitation, ***prevent errors commonly associated with re-input of a character.*** See columns 1, lines 40-67, column 2, lines 34-45, and columns 9-10.

Kantrowitz does not explicitly teach defining a tag set to prevent errors or a markup description language. DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language which meets the limitation, ***application data written in a markup description.*** See column 2, lines 58-67. DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with a error correcting code such as a Hamming code in order to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered should it be edited by an infringer which meets the portion of the limitation, ***a tag set to prevent errors***. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kantrowitz's correction of characters with DeMont's defining of a tag set to prevent errors because replacing the written information with an error correction coded tag helps reduce the amount of errors resulting from missing spaces, shifted spaces, confusable words, etc. and also allows a document to be recovered should it be edited by someone else. See column 2, lines 34-45 of Kantrowitz and column 4, lines 19-26 of DeMont.

Kantrowitz nor DeMont teaches ***a character has a shape so complicated that when produced by a low-resolution facsimile machine or paper, the image of the character appears solid and ambiguous.***

However, Kopec teaches some glyphs (i.e. characters) often have very slight differences such as the letter "l" and the number "1" in a transcription and can lead to errors when the transcription is generated by an OCR operation and the glyphs occurring in bitmapped images produced from well-known sources such as scanning and faxing processes are subject to being degraded by image noise and distortion which contribute to uncertainty in the actual appearance of the glyph's bitmap and reduce recognition accuracy which meets the limitation, ***a character has a shape so complicated that when produced by a low-resolution facsimile machine or paper, the image of the character appears solid and ambiguous.*** See page 4, lines 16-34 through page 8.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the error correction support of Kantrowitz and DeMont with Kopec's transcription correction because providing error correction support was desirable in OCR operations in order to improve the recognition accuracy of such systems. See page 1, lines 40-60 of Kantrowitz.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-2, 4-11, and 20-24 have been fully considered and are not persuasive. It is noted claim 24 is a newly added claim rejected above.

Examiner notes rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101 and 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been withdrawn pursuant to Applicant's amendments and remarks on pages 11-12 filed on 05/05/08.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Beginning on pages 13 and continuing through page 14, Applicant individually attacks the primary reference, Kantrowitz, for failing to teach "application data written in a markup description language exchanged between computers". Examiner relied on DeMont to teach this portion of the limitation. Specifically, DeMont discloses creating an electronic document using a markup language which meets the limitation, ***application data written in a markup description***. See column 2, lines 58-67.

Applicant argues the secondary reference, DeMont, fails to teach the feature of "defining a tag set to prevent errors; using the tag set to add rewritten information". Applicant's arguments make broad statements such as "DeMont's error correction is 1)

different from the instantly claimed invention and 2) not employed to prevent errors during re-input of markup description language". Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Examiner disagrees with Applicant's assertions concerning DeMont.

DeMont teaches the characters in the document are converted to an ASCII string which are concatenated to form an 80-bit binary string then augmented with an error correcting code such as a Hamming code to increase the likelihood that the message can be recovered. See column 3, lines 55-67 and column 4, lines 19-26.

In view of the comments above, the rejections are maintained.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rachna S. Desai whose telephone number is 571-272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176
07/15/08